

# Identity

**Magazine of the British National Party**

May 2006 - Issue 66 - £2.40

## THE TIDE HAS TURNED

**4th May 2006 - Record Numbers of BNP Councillors are Elected**







# May's News

## » Peugeot Workers Victims of Globalism

The coming closure of the Peugeot factory at Ryton, Coventry will mean the loss of more than the 2,300 jobs at the car plant. There could be as many as an extra 10,000 jobs lost at component manufacturers supplying Peugeot - as there was at Rover. New Labour, Tories and Lib Dems are all fully supportive of the global capitalist system that is taking our manufacturing jobs to countries offering cheaper labour costs (in Peugeot's case the jobs are likely to go to Slovakia). It is only the BNP that demands protection of our remaining manufacturing jobs.

Although the Peugeot job losses caught the public eye, few are aware that BAE Systems, Britain's largest defence contractor, is to sell its 20% stake in Airbus. BAE has assured its workers that their jobs manufacturing the wings for the A380 superjumbo are safe. Maybe, but it brings to mind the owners of the *Titanic* who said it was unsinkable.

BAE is expected to net between £3bn and £4.5bn from the sale and is expected to use the money to fund acquisitions overseas, specifically in the US. And how would this further act of globalism protect BAE's UK jobs?

## » Jailed For Slurs Against Muslims

Bryan Cork, 49, shouted slurs at Muslims outside a Carlisle mosque including "I'm proud to be British" and "go back to where you came from". He admitted he had been drinking and pleaded guilty to racially aggravated harassment.

Judge Paul Batty sentenced him to six months imprisonment, in spite of Cork's clean record.

## » Who Stole MoD Firearms?

Nearly a hundred firearms, including some automatic rifles, have been

stolen from the Ministry of Defence's Whitehall HQ and some regional bases over five years. In total £2.5m worth of equipment had been stolen including ammunition, explosives and even tank engines.

Tory peer Lord Hanningfield said: "It would be unthinkable if such equipment ended up in the hands of organised criminals or terrorists."

Where did he think they had gone: The Girl Guides?

## » Fishing For Asian Anglers

It may be Britain's most popular participation sport but angling is too white and too masculine for the government. The Environment Agency is embarking on a campaign to spend some of the £19m received from fishing licences to attract Asian women and other ethnic minorities to the sport. A new leaflet from the agency says: "Angling does not discriminate against gender, race, age or athletic ability".

A pilot scheme in Swansea is using experts from the Salmon and Trout Association to teach Muslim women and children to fish.

When we read this in the *Sunday Times* of April 2<sup>nd</sup> we thought it must be a belated April fool joke.

## » Terror Suspect Gets Tour of Parliament

A terror suspect said to be linked to al Qaeda, Mahmoud Suliman Ahmed Abu Rideh, was last month invited to the Houses of Parliament as the guest of Labour Peer, Lord Ahmed, who met him three years ago at Regent's Park mosque. This security risk was given a Security sticker for his visit.

## » No TB Check on 200,000 Immigrants

Tuberculosis was virtually eliminated as a major public health risk in this country. It is now revealed that immigration services are failing to

check nearly 200,000 migrants a year for TB when they arrive in Britain. The Health Protection Agency found that only a quarter of arrivals from high risk countries were X-rayed in accordance with government policy.

There has been a step rise in the number of cases of TB in this country, most of them among immigrants from Africa, Pakistan and Eastern Europe. The HPA said that a system of follow-ups, where the Immigration Service is supposed to pass information to local health services for screenings, is "inefficient and ineffective", partly because new arrivals often give false addresses.

## » Some Towns 'Too White'

The ultimate in PC multicultural nonsense comes from one of the government's senior race relations advisers, Professor Ted Cattle. He has criticised communities in some parts of the country for being "unhealthily all white."

He has suggested (we assume he was serious, and sober) that people from ethnic minorities in some parts of the Midlands might not feel "safe and secure" living near predominantly white communities.

In an apparent reference to Heanor, a predominantly white town in the Amber Valley area of Derbyshire, Cattle said he was concerned about the strength of support for the BNP in some parts of the East Midlands.

# identity

Editor: John Bean  
Design: Mark Collett  
May 2006

Public reference:  
ISSN 1469-7971  
Subscriptions Dept:  
PO Box 87, Ossett,  
Wakefield, WF5 8WN  
Tel: 0870 75 73 267.

Please note that we receive more material than we can publish. Articles should be submitted to the addresses below in typed/electronic format:  
PO Box 97, Newmarket,  
Suffolk CB8 1WT.  
Email: [Identitymatters@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:Identitymatters@yahoo.co.uk).





# The NHS is not a Third World Relief Organisation



» Who would have thought that Britain's National Health Service, once the envy of the world, would be facing collapse, with its long suffering nursing staff threatening to go on strike, having forced the Health Secretary, Patricia Hewitt, to abandon her address to the annual conference of the Royal College of Nursing? Whilst the demand for services has never been greater, and with hospital waiting lists growing ever longer (despite Blair's claim to the contrary), we have the astounding situation of more than 7,000 hospital job losses in the past month. A thousand of these jobs went at the University Hospital of North Staffordshire, but hundreds are going at many hospitals (including my local) all over the country, north and south, as NHS Trusts and hospitals struggle to balance their books.

New Labour's Tory and Lib Dem opponents rightfully point to the billions of taxpayer's money that have been wasted by the NHS, much of it being due to bureaucracy. £2.8bn is the extra money given to the army of managers and bureaucrats that are supposed to run the NHS. Then there is an extra £1.75bn cost, according to a public spending review last year, of three unnecessary layers of bureaucracy, and a £578m increase in managers' pay in two years.

What the old parties are reluctant to admit, however, is the additional factor of mass immigration that is playing a major part in crippling our health service. Immigrants get sick, whether they are legal, illegal, so-called asylum-seekers, or just NHS 'health tourists', all putting great pressure on the NHS which the overwhelming majority have not paid one penny towards its upkeep. It has in fact become a Third World relief organisation, whose services are, if you are lucky, also available to those who have paid for its establishment and upkeep.

This is because in practice the hospitals can hardly manage to distinguish between those who are legal and those who are illegal. And can you imagine a harassed hospital receptionist daring to say "no" to an applicant? She is forbidden to refuse treatment on grounds of race, gender, sexual orientation, etc, etc. As Charles Moore pointed out in an article in the *Daily Telegraph*, 29.04.06, the NHS guidance says that the service must be offered only to people who are "ordinarily" resident here, and defines this as "someone who is living lawfully in the UK voluntarily and for settled purposes as part of their life for the time being, with an identifiable purpose for their residence here."

This original definition of who was entitled to our National Health Service has long ago been abandoned. As in housing, medical assistance is now offered on the basis of "need" rather than the conventional waiting list, which means that newly arrived immigrants, including those from Africa with AIDS and those from Pakistan with TB, jump the queue, with the resultant cost of further billions to the long suffering taxpayer.

If the BNP's demand for an end to further immigration and the deportation of those immigrants who have arrived illegally, or broke our laws, was put in force then this would obviously take some pressure off our NHS.

Additionally, there must be a war on bureaucracy. We call for an overhaul of drug purchasing procedures - multinational pharmaceutical companies must provide better value for money and not get rich at the cost of British taxpayers. We will support decent wages and conditions for frontline health workers to stop the trained and experienced quitting the profession, including paying trainee nurses for overtime, also attracting home grown recruits to a profession which deserves greater recognition within the national community.

Above all, the NHS must remain free for British taxpayers at the point of treatment.

## BNP's Astounding Election Result

For the BNP to win another 33 election victories (giving a present total of 53 council seats) can only be described as 'astounding' if one takes into account the campaign of vilification that was launched against the BNP by the popular press and Marxist trade union bosses. As most TV coverage of the BNP campaign was mainly factual (with the exception of some Sky News reports), the BNP's success was a victory over 'pressocracy'.

The result has firmly established the British National Party as Britain's fastest growing party and the fourth most influential. The Greens fielded nearly four times as many candidates as the BNP but gained only 20 seats. UKIP, who gained one seat and lost one, is now a dead duck in the water. We welcome the increased influx of its ill-served members to the ranks of the BNP.

Above all, let us praise the courage of those 356 BNP candidates who were prepared to raise their heads above the parapets. We will not forget them.

**John Bean**



# Modern Nationalism - The New Force In Politics



» Nick Griffin says that to talk generally of "the nationalist movement" as if it was a universal, homogeneous political outlook is a fallacy. There are three main forms of nationalism: Civic Nationalism, which describes UKIP; the Modern Nationalism of the British National Party and similar groups abroad, and Neo-Fascism, which although it may have been present at the birth of the original BNP has long since been rejected by it.

» "The nationalist movement." The phrase is used all the time among BNP members and on Internet forums around the world, but how many people stop to think what it really means? This is no idle speculation, but rather a matter of fundamental importance. We need not only to ask the question, but to find the right answer, for to get one of the wrong ones would be to doom our efforts to failure and our people to minority status, oppression and effective extinction.

The first thing to note is that there are indeed several 'wrong answers'. For despite the naive claims of the "all good nationalists in it together" theorists, the nationalist movement is not one homogeneous block, and any attempt to treat it as such is liable to lead to disaster.

The British National Party is, it is true, a broad church, and so it should remain. Both the Celts and the Anglo-Saxons have been renowned through centuries as being unusually

individualistic and as setting great store by freedom of thought, speech and - within the limits set by the conditions and imperatives of the time - action.

But there is a big difference between being a healthily broad church and allowing our ranks to include factions whose ideas of 'nationalism' are incompatible with either commonsense, significant popular support or organisational stability.

## WELL MEANING

From the point of view of the BNP itself at present, there is no real possibility of such 'guaranteed-to-fail' positions being taken seriously within the party, but externally - in countries as varied as the USA, France and Australia - it is a different matter. All over the world, and among so-called 'nationalist' rivals of ours in Britain herself (UKIP, for instance), sincere and well-meaning people are wasting precious years of

the frighteningly short space of time left to the men of the West.

This time is being wasted partly because what is commonly viewed as a single "nationalist movement" (albeit one made up of numerous parties and political tendencies) is in fact three mutually incompatible blocks. The edges that divide them are often blurred, complete with overlaps and individuals and groups alike crossing from one block to another. But despite this occasional haziness, the three beasts are in fact very different animals and misguided attempts to gloss over those differences or to create a hybrid invariably lead to bitter failure.

The three very different versions of 'nationalism' are well summed up in the diagram of three adjacent ellipses reproduced with this article.

Nationalists of most stripes maintain that the old left-right continuum of conventional politics cannot be applied to us (on matters such as favouring the family unit or



capital punishment for many premeditated murders, for example, we are seen by leftists as 'right-wing', while in standing for social justice and against globalisation we are regarded by reactionaries as 'left-wing').

Naturally, the BNP agrees with this rejection of the left-right line being applied to us relative to the old party system. But while left-right cannot be applied to compare nationalists with non-nationalists, it is rather useful in comparing one group of nationalists to another. Hence, on the left of the trisected nationalist continuum, we find the parties and individuals who are best summed up as Civic Nationalists.

### ACCIDENT OF BIRTH

The essence of civic nationalism is the belief that an individual's or community's fundamental identity is determined by mere accident of birth, or by choice. To put it bluntly, any featherless biped which finds itself in France and is willing to speak French and salute the tricolour is 'French'. Any Mexican or Haitian who manages to get a US work permit and to learn a couple of bars of the Star Spangled Banner 'becomes' an 'American'. And any Congolese 'refugee' who picks up enough of Shakespeare's tongue not only to ask for asylum and benefits but also to pledge loyalty to England or Scotland is miraculously turned into an Englishman or a Scot.

I use 'English' and 'Scottish' rather than 'British' because there are indeed British-based nationalist parties - the miniscule English Democrats and the quasi-Marxist Scottish Nationalist Party which provide perfect examples of the civic nationalist position.

Despite its occasional vote-catching forays into low-grade racist rhetoric ("All Arabs are suicide-bombers and limb-amputators," said the Labour stooge Robert Kilroy-Silk as his briefly adopted party was puffed up by the Establishment media in order to block our Euro-election chances in 2004) the UK Independence Party is also civic nationalist. Hence its recent announcement that it would allow in as many non-white immigrants each year as native Brits emigrate, and Nigel Farage's condemnation of proposals to impose tougher limits on immigration from black Africa than from white Poland as being 'racist'.

(Incidentally, while we have a

number of members of Polish descent, they or their parents came to Britain in the middle of the last century, asked for nothing except the opportunity to work hard and raise their families safe from Communist tyranny, and integrated into our culture and way of life.

But while we accept such fully assimilated European minorities as members of our nation, we are firmly opposed to the East European mass immigration tidal wave which is at present depressing the wages and prospects of skilled and unskilled British workers alike. In short, if we were in power we wouldn't have the black Africans or those Polish builders that senior UKIP members have recently been caught employing, to the dismay of their hard-working rank and file).

As a general rule, civic nationalist parties like UKIP are also in favour of

globalisation. Thus UKIP's leaders profess opposition to the EU (though not to EU expense accounts) but would happily sink Britain's economic independence in an expanded North American Free Trade Association.

This, however, is not always the case. As one moves from the left to the right hand edge of the civic nationalist ellipse one finds it includes more obviously and genuinely nationalist parties, such as the Vlaams Belang (formerly the Vlaams Blok, before its banning as a "threat to democracy" by Belgium's liberal Establishment) and the Front National.

The very welcome and high-profile support lent to the BNP's 2004 European election campaign by the FN's Jean-Marie Le Pen provides a perfect example of the overlap between the 'right-wing' edge of civic nationalism and the next ellipse - the



free trade and unrestricted capitalism. Here too they show their essentially materialistic view of the world, one that springs from the Establishment liberalism which engulfed Thatcherite-style Conservatism all over the white world in the 1980s.

Quite often, in fact, the only real argument between civic nationalists and their Establishment opponents is over the geographical location of the institutions presiding over the destruction of our identity by immigration and of our economy by

Modern Nationalist one occupied by the British National Party.

This position could also be described as "Ethno-Nationalism", but the trouble with anything that sounds to ordinary people like "ethnic" is that it has been turned into a swearword by several decades of left-liberal propaganda about the wonders of "ethnic minorities" and the wickedness of those who resent the way the liberal political elite have allowed "ethnics" to take over our country.

Conversely, it cannot be described






as "White Nationalism", since we neither advocate nor regard as remotely realistic the concept of one worldwide white "nation". White racial nationalists (who are almost exclusively American, which accounts for their total lack of understanding of the way in which the ancient nations of Europe are the key focus of the instinctive loyalty of their populations) by definition see no distinction at all between different whites. They would thus be happy with any number of immigrants pouring into Britain just as long as they are racially white. The BNP, by contrast, recognises that culture, language and common historical experience are all factors which combine with racial origin to decide who is - and who is not - part of our nation.

Thus, unlike racial nationalist purists, we would be opposed to the arrival at Dover of several million German or Swedish immigrants. In small numbers such peoples can indeed integrate into our society completely, without the faintest possibility of damage to either our cultural or ethnic identity, to our unique gene pool or overcrowded environment. Larger numbers, however - blonde hair and blue eyes notwithstanding - would become a problem.

Equally, however, our world-view starts from the real-life fact that ethnic or racial characteristics not only exist, but that most people in their unbrainwashed state are pre-programmed to recognise and respond to them. Our definition of which groups can, and which cannot, integrate into our society and in what numbers recognises this simple fact of life.

### MODERN NATIONALISM

The phrase Modern Nationalism is not used rhetorically to impose a propagandistic value judgement (as in "we're up-to-date, you're old fashioned, yah boo, sucks to you") as a substitute for genuine analysis. Rather, it's used for the simple reason that this is a genuinely very recent synthesis. While it is true that there have been several brief and short-lived spring flowerings of this ideology - starting with John Bean's early efforts in the 1960s - it has not formed a coherent and firmly based position



### The Stranger

*The stranger within my gate,  
He may be true or kind,  
But he does not talk my talk  
I cannot feel his mind.  
I see the face and the eyes and the mouth,  
But not the soul behind.*

*The men of my own stock,  
They may do ill or well,  
But they tell the lies I am wonted to,  
They are used to the lies I tell;  
And we do not need interpreters  
When we go to buy and sell.*

*The Stranger within my gates,  
He may be evil or good,  
But I cannot tell what powers control  
What reasons sway his mood;  
Nor when the Gods of his far-off land  
Shall repossess his blood.*

*The men of my own stock,  
Bitter bad they may be,  
But, at least, they hear the things I hear,  
And see the things I see;  
And whatever I think of them and their likes  
They think of the likes of me.*

*This was my father's belief  
And this is also mine:  
Let the corn be all one sheaf  
And the grapes be all one vine,  
Ere our children's teeth are set on edge  
By bitter bread and wine.*

- Rudyard Kipling

until our own time.

In other countries as well, the fundamentals of this kind of nationalism - our radical critique of identity-destroying liberalism, our rejection of totalitarianism, identification with peoples of other cultures who oppose the same problems of deracination and individualistic alienation that concern us, and our determination to build a society based on the realities and limitations of nature - have only merged into a coherent world view in recent years.

So what do Modern Nationalists believe? That human beings are only truly human when they belong to a society based not on atomised consumerism but on shared identity,

common values, a sense of mutually experienced history and communal recognition of what constitutes 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable' behaviour.

We look at the lessons of history and see that the only societies in which such a sense of belonging and commonality exist are those in which the overwhelming majority of the population share not just the same language, national anthem, flag, or even religion, but also ethnic origin.

We note that what we learn from commonsense is supported by the ever-growing body of scientific evidence from socio-biologists and evolutionary psychiatrists for an innate and ineradicable human tendency towards kin-based extended



altruism, and a corresponding resistance to the presence of significant numbers of 'others'.

Having grown up in the last few decades of the monstrous and doomed Communist attempt to override human nature in matters of economics and private property, we recognise in the PC mania for mass immigration, racial integration and 'equality' precisely the same disastrous Marxist tendency to put dogma before reality.

To put it simply: Multiracialism and multiculturalism don't work, and since we don't want our country to end up like Bosnia or Rwanda we have no choice but to speak out, even if it would sometimes be politically expedient to stay silent.

There is also a positive side to our rejection of the integrationist model of multi-culturalism: Recognising that individual homo sapiens are only truly human when able to live and belong to a community in which they feel 'at home', we believe that the maintenance of human cultural and ethnic diversity is essential if we are to meet fundamental human needs and natural rights.

So we look with horror at the estimates by ethnographers that the 6,000 separate and distinct ethnic/cultural/linguistic cultures which make up the rich tapestry of mankind today will be reduced to a mere 800 by the end of this century. Such a catastrophic wipe-out of human diversity would impoverish not just the peoples whose traditions and core identities would vanish, but every single person on the planet who has ever enjoyed some aspect of someone else's culture for the simple reason that 'variety is the spice of life'.

Civic nationalist parties - which often parade 'token' non-whites in a vain effort to win the approval of inherently anti-nationalist media pundits - are not as dangerous to human bio-cultural diversity as the exterminationist global integrationism of liberal capitalism. But their unprincipled and naive propositional nationalism is still part of the problem, whereas we Modern Nationalists intend to be part of the solution.

For the liberal-left, 'diversity' is a code-word for the destruction of our society through mass immigration. For the globalists, 'diversity' is a stepping stone to the unified market and

maximum profits of a culture-free, coffee-coloured McWorld. For us, on the other hand, diversity is the basis of humanity, something to be respected and preserved rather than abused and destroyed.

We do not oppose integration because we 'hate' others, but precisely because we love our own and understand and sympathise with those who feel the same way about their own. This is the root of our opposition to integrationism, and of our determination to lead the way by rejecting integration within our own parties and seeking cordial but separate relationships with people from other stocks and cultures.

### BEST PEOPLE

So who, apart from the BNP, are in this central nationalist block? Sweden's National Democrats, Australia First and many individual Americans are already on board, as are large numbers of the best people in the various nationalist parties in places such as France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Austria and Spain.

Encouraging and linking up with such fellow-thinkers is not a question of intellectual vanity. In the EU in particular, it looks increasingly likely that the liberal-left fascist federal state project is advancing so quickly towards totalitarianism that the only realistic way of getting rid of it will be a concerted effort by a future alliance of

nationalist MEPs. One day they must arrive in Brussels with a common democratic mandate to strip the unelected Commissioners of their power and repatriate all sovereignty back to the home nations from which it was filched in the first place. Hence our need to form close links with people on our wavelength right across the present European Union, for the nationalist revolution is likely to be internationalist in scope.

That does not, however, mean committing political suicide by hooking up with the people to the right of us Modern Nationalists - the ones in the Neo-Fascist ellipse. The term is used descriptively rather than pejoratively, even though their innocent stupidity and the threat it poses to the survival of the white peoples of the world means they do really deserve to be slated.

That said, this ellipse undoubtedly does include some individuals, perhaps even entire parties, who can be salvaged and brought into the potentially effective mainstream of nationalism if they are only made to think long enough and hard enough about ideology, practical politics and the unutterably grim end in sight for our children if we do not reverse present trends. Which is why we must and will continue to try to influence those people and parties who we believe can be turned into genuine modern nationalists.

The civic nationalist approach, although superficially practical, is in



ANOTHER GRAVE IN BOSNIA: The bitter wages of the sin of multiculturalism





fact short-sighted and intellectually incoherent. Lacking an ideological base, it is also especially vulnerable to being co-opted by the present Establishment, or to being watered down by creeping liberalism until it ceases to be anything other than a job-winning machine for its extended leadership. Even a political 'victory' for this approach is likely to end on the lines of *Animal Farm*, where the 'nationalist' pigs become indistinguishable from the liberal-capitalist farmers.

### NEO-FASCIST FOLLY

There are two ways to sell-out an ideal: One is to abandon it, either by accident or design, as the civic nationalists do. The other is to make it unsaleable, which is the criminal folly of the neo-fascist block which squats like a poisonous toad on the right hand end of the nationalist continuum.

Poisonous, because all our opponents have to do to turn three Modern Nationalist steps forward into two steps back in the public eye is to show a few idiots 'siege-heiling' at a skinhead concert, or recount the 'hardline' opinions spouted by some armchair warrior on a noisy but useless internet forum.

Especially destructive is the fixation (private or public) many of these people have with the empty trappings of the nationalist totalitarianisms of the 1930s. For those were in reality nothing but a mirror image of

the brutal Bolshevism whose threat distorted European politics into a dictatorial and fanatical mould drastically at odds with the innate individualism and thirst for freedom which have characterised Western man from the dawn of recorded history.

On the continent in particular there are, to be fair, some sensible, sincere and would-be constructive people who still seem unable to step out of this dead-end cult of historical necrophilia. Some of them will read this - they are supposed to - and be hurt by it - something that is unfortunate but necessary.

We need them to look at what they do, to look at the books they publish and the music and badges they sell, and to see these things not through the eyes of their own faithful hardcore, but from the point of view of the millions of 'ordinary' voters in their country.

They are not in the least bit concerned with the rights, wrongs or tragedies of a war that ended almost a lifetime ago. But they are worried about the growing threats to their own happiness and security, and to their children's freedom and identity.

These are the issues we must address if nationalism is to overcome all the odds stacked against us and so come to power. And these are the problems we must address once we are in power. Historical debate is for historians in times of peace and plenty, not for politicians in times of mortal danger and the coming Age of Scarcity.

Numerically, and in terms of 'reach' into the broader population, the civic and modern nationalists make up the overwhelming majority of the entire continuum. In fact, despite the civic nationalist position adopted by their PC-cowed leaderships, it is likely that the majority of UKIP activists and even rank-and-file Tories are by instinct modern nationalists.

A minority of these people disillusioned by the incompetence, corruption and cowardice of their old parties' leaders - will end up reading this article as they try to decide where they really belong. They only need to ask themselves a couple of questions about how they feel when they see an African walking down their High Street.

If they think he'd make a smashing husband for their daughter, and that it's a step forward for humanity whenever two unique gene pools and cultures are wiped out by such integration, we don't want them.


If they wouldn't dream of inviting him to dinner but think he'd make splendid window-dressing for the BNP as a token 'ethnic' candidate, we don't want them unless they're prepared to accept that the people who have built this party disagree and to abide by our judgement.

If they hate him and want to do him harm, or rant about him being a 'mud' on an internet forum, we don't want them.

But if you can look at that African and, while assuming that he is a perfectly decent human being, resent the politicians who have allowed him to come and settle in our country at our expense, without any democratic mandate for this monstrous social and genetic modification programme - then you belong with us.

Furthermore, if you understand that a Zulu, even an English-speaking Zulu who wears a suit and works in an office in Croydon, will always remain and should always remain a Zulu. And if you know that an English rose, even if born in Pakistan like, for instance, Joanna Lumley, is English and could never be a Pakistani. And if you understand what Rudyard Kipling - a man who loved all the peoples of the British Empire but was far too wise to believe that they were the same meant when he wrote *The Stranger*, then you too are a Modern Nationalist, and you belong with us. Welcome aboard!

**From Los Angeles to Moscow, the neo-fascist skinhead cult gives the left-lib media a stick with which to beat nationalist parties**





# May '06 Election Breakthrough



**CENTRE: Jubilant BNP councillors at the Barking and Dagenham count.**

**LEFT & RIGHT: The twelve victors in our biggest breakthrough to date.**

» "Their finest hour." This was the verdict of senior *Mail on Sunday* political commentator Peter Dobbie on the BNP's stunning "against all odds" election victories on May 4<sup>th</sup>. Nor was he alone in this assessment. The British National Party breakthrough was the story of the night on TV and radio coverage of the English local council elections, and made headlines in both local and national newspapers for several days.

Some more leftwing commentators sought to dismiss the results as a one-off protest of no long term significance, but Mr. Dobbie clearly disagrees:

"As we watch the sun set on his premiership, we hear Blair desperately seeks a political legacy. He has one. It lives on in the disillusioned heartlands of Essex. It is written all over the smiling faces of elected BNP councillors."

The only weak point of this analysis is the way it focuses solely on Barking, and on the taking of working class votes from Labour. For the reality is that the British National Party broke through in the West Midlands, Lancashire and Yorkshire, and is winning the hearts of Middle England as well as the neglected poor.

The full results appear in this month's issue of *Freedom*, and include such astounding achievements as Paul Cromie taking the solid Tory Bradford suburb of Queensbury, Sharon Ebanks and Chris Beverley winning our first ever seats in Birmingham and Leeds, Dave Thomson taking the third seat in the Burnley ward of Hapton-with-Park to make it the first 100% BNP ward in the country, and our taking a quarter of the vote in seats in cities such as Manchester and Newcastle, where our candidates could only get joke votes just a few years ago.

"Last Thursday saw a kind of revenge when the angry white working class lashed out. Sick of hearing that yet another foreign criminal - one facing charges of terrorism - had been released on to the streets, the voters of Barking fell in behind the BNP.

And while this result will be disregarded by the Government, many more folk across the country will have woken to the news and quietly have nodded their heads.

- Peter Dobbie, *Mail on Sunday*

With so much media attention on our victories in Essex (where we also won our first seats in Havering and Redbridge, and doubled to six our number of councillors in Epping Forest) this *Identity* report will concentrate instead on our successes in the West Midlands.

The most dramatic West Midlands breakthrough was of course Sharon Ebanks' win in Kingstanding, Birmingham. Standing as the sole BNP candidate in a ward where a by-election meant that two seats were up for grabs, Sharon easily topped the poll with 2,310 votes, compared with 2,088 and 1,973 for her nearest rivals, the two Labour candidates.

The vote remained the same even when Labour called for two recounts, in which every single ballot was watched

intently by the candidates, agents, and scrutineers of all the parties, as well as by the election officials. Sharon was then duly declared the winner and everyone except the Returning Officer and a couple of other officials left the building.

The council staff then decided to hold another (illegal) recount, which revealed that every single

person present earlier had been 'mistaken', and that many votes had been 'counted twice' three times over. Even more amazing, most of these were BNP votes. With these removed from the equation, the British National Party had - they claimed in excited calls to the media - only come third!

Unfortunately for the anti-BNP fanatics on the council and in the media, once a candidate has been formally declared the winner the result can only be overturned by a High Court order. Even if they have the nerve to go through with this patently groundless attempt to defraud the





electors of Kingstanding, the conspirators will therefore have to put up for many months with Councillor Sharon Ebanks representing the British National Party on Birmingham City Council. And, needless to say, we will fight any such legal action tooth and nail.

Elsewhere in the West Midlands, the biggest advance was in Sandwell, where lone BNP councillor Jamie Lloyd is now joined by the immensely dedicated Simon Smith, who beat his Labour rival in Great Bridge by a comfortable 181 votes, fine activist Russell Green who gained 1,128 votes and 43.5% of the vote to take Princes End, and rising star speaker Carl Butler who won Tividale with 1,191 good Black Country votes.

The other six BNP candidates in the borough all came good seconds, beating the Conservatives every time. Particularly notable was Steven Parkes' result in Tipton Green, where we were just 73 votes off winning. With all but one of these second places being to Labour, the prospect for the BNP in Sandwell next year - after another 12 months of national and local New Labour betrayals - is clearly outstanding.

### UKIP SPOILING TACTICS

Unfortunately, the intervention of UKIP spoiler candidates in neighbouring Dudley cost us one or even two seats. This is particularly sinister given the fact that UKIP's General Election campaign in the borough last year was assisted by donations of money, manpower and help with propaganda production from 'mystery' donors opposed to the BNP. UKIP were manipulated in the same way in Barking (where their main man is the bitterly anti-BNP brother of a Labour councillor) as well, but were steam-rolled by the local BNP juggernaut.



**SHARON EBANKS: Birmingham's first BNP councillor**

very significant effort required to exercise our legal right to fix our own seals to the ballot boxes (in fact, the only seats we won in Yorkshire were in wards where we sealed the boxes). In addition to reports of BNP postal votes being found discarded in Bradford and Burnley - where solid evidence has already been passed to the police - we also have enough pointers to fraud to have been able to report it to the authorities in Birmingham, Heanor in Derbyshire and Halifax.

Whether as a result of having our votes fraudulently 'skimmed', or simply of having new candidates who have

### LEEDS



**Chris Beverley**

### BRADFORD



**Paul Cromie**

### REDDITCH



**David Enderby**

### REDBRIDGE



**Julian Leppert**

### BURNLEY



**Derek Dawson**

As a result, Stoke remains the place in the region with the most British National Party councillors, as a result of a great night in the city which saw three more join Steve Batkin and Mark Leat. Neil Walker took Abbey Green (where we narrowly missed out in a by-election three years ago), Phillip Sandland now holds Bentilee ward, and Tony Simmonds captured Weston and Meir with 32.9%.

Meanwhile, on either side of Birmingham, Solihull and Redditch voters now have BNP councillors to stand up for commonsense as a result of stunning wins for George Morgan in Chelmsley Wood and David Enderby in Winyates ward respectively.

Looking at the results overall, there is a deeply suspicious trend towards our having won seats which we were not expected too, or in which our officials made the

not yet had time to establish a firm base with door-to-door *Freedom* sales and grass-roots community work, we now have some fifty seats where we were fewer than 100 votes from winning. In Burnley, for example, a total of a further 85 votes would have won us four extra seats!

The key to making further big advances next year is to get back to work straight away in these wards in order to bed our candidates in and pile up enough votes to overcome the fiddles. In addition, we must identify a further wedge of seats which are similar in socio-economic and demographic terms, which we haven't fought before but which show just as much promise. We have literally hundreds to choose from now. All we need to win in such places is a good candidate and a small back-up team for each one. How about you?





# BNP Council Map of England

**NOTE: We also hold four town council seats**

May 2006

Election Round Up

## **Burnley**

Briercliffe - Patricia Thompson  
Cliviger with Worsthorne - Brian Turner  
Gannow - Carol Hughes  
Gannow - Derek Dawson  
Hapton with Park - David Thomson  
Hapton with Park - Leonard Starr  
Hapton with Park - Sharon Wilkinson

## **Pendle**

Marsden - Brian Parker

## **Bradford**

Queensbury - Paul Cromie  
Wyke - James Lewthwaite

## **Calderdale**

Illingworth & Mixenden - Geoff Wallace  
Illingworth & Mixenden - Richard Mulhall

## **Kirklees**

Dewsbury East - Colin Auty  
Heckmondwike - David Exley  
Heckmondwike - Roger Roberts

## **Leeds**

Morley South - Chris Beverley

## **Birmingham**

Kingstanding - Sharon Ebanks

## **Redditch**

Winyates - David Enderby

## **Sandwell**

Great Bridge - Simon Smith  
Princes End - Russell Green  
Princes End - James Lloyd  
Tividale - Carl Butler

## **Solihull**

Chelmsley Wood - George Morgan

## **Stoke**

Abbey Green - Neil Walker  
Bentilee & Townsend - Phillip Sandland  
Longton North - Mark Leat  
Longton North - Steve Batkin  
Weston & Meir North - Anthony Simmonds

## **Broxbourne**

Rosedale - Ramon Johns

## **Havering**

Gooshays - Alan Bailey

## **Redbridge**

Hainault - Julian Leppert

## **Epping Forest**

Loughton Broadway - Susan Clapp  
Loughton Alderton - Terence Farr  
Loughton Alderton - Rodney Law  
Loughton Fairmead - Pat Richardson  
Loughton Broadway - Tom Richardson  
Loughton Fairmead - Peter Turpin

## **Barking and Dagenham**

Alibon - Claire Doncaster  
Alibon - Robert Bailey  
Eastbury - Geoffrey Steed  
Goresbrook - Richard Barnbrook  
Goresbrook - Tracy Lansdown  
Mayesbrook - Christine Knight  
Mayesbrook - Robert Buckley  
Parsloes - Darren Tuffs  
Parsloes - Ronald Doncaster  
Valance - Lawrence Rustem  
Valance - Sandra Doncaster  
Village - Jamie Jarvis





» John Bean Explains:

# Why We Must Reject Judeo-Obsessivism



Anti-zionist Orthodox Jews demonstrate against the sate of Israel

» Some nationalists are so fixated on the enemies of our people that the search for these enemies consumes their energy and becomes a cause in itself, taking precedence over their understanding of nationalism. Craving a well-defined and theatrical concept of the enemy, they buy into elaborate myths designed to set one up as the absolute evil, and then spend their lives battering away at it.

Thus some nationalists have become 'hooked' on the Jews as all-purpose villains, responsible for everything that's wrong with Britain, and whose destruction is the master key to putting things right. The fact that some Jews really *are* villains, who *have* done us harm, makes this very tempting, because there is always real evidence of Jewish wrong-doing available, even though it doesn't prove that *all* Jews are wrong-doers.

The BNP is not politically correct, and makes no apology for saying that it is strategically useful, and morally legitimate, for us to fight *genuinely* bad Jews. The idea that no Jews *ever* do anything bad, contradicts observable fact, and the idea we have no right to fight back is unilateral disarmament. But to generalise this into the assumption that all Jews are like the Marxist, multiculturalist, and globalist ones who are genuine enemies, is neither factually true, morally right, nor useful to our cause.

The master key to a sensible attitude towards the Jews is this: *treat them like any other foreign people*. They are different from us, and sometimes our friends and sometimes our enemies, at different historical moments, but they are neither

intrinsically evil nor always the enemy.

Consider the French, Germans, Russians, Americans, and Japanese. All have done Britain benefit and harm at different points in history. We have been on the same and opposite sides of each in wars. But this doesn't make anti-Frenchism, anti-Germanism, or anti-Russianism sensible: i.e. the assumption these nations are *permanent* enemies, simply because of who they are, rather than what they may be doing at a given moment.

This we can call *ethno-realpolitik*. Its essence was famously expressed by Foreign Secretary Lord Palmerston in 1848:

*'Britain has no permanent friends or permanent enemies; only permanent interests.'*

Any other attitude towards a foreign nation is strategically witless, and we cannot afford strategic witlessness in a dangerous world.

## LOGIC

The same logic entails that there is no factual basis for anti-Semitism, i.e. the belief that Jews are intrinsically our enemy. The worst one can truthfully say of the Jews is that they are intrinsically opportunistic. To survive in other people's countries for 2,000 years, they obviously have to be. But this doesn't make them intrinsically bad; only people who will, like anyone else, pursue their self-interest according to the circumstances of the time. We shouldn't *surrender* to their pursuit of self-interest. We should, naturally, pursue our own, but in a calm and rational way in the same manner as we deal with other foreign societies,

without hatred, mythology, or hostile intent.

Some Judeo-obsessives use passages in the Talmud to argue that Jews are *not* like every other nation, but have an intrinsic and eternal hostility to gentiles. But the Talmud is not holy scripture, or the purported word of God, but only commentary by famous rabbis. That it contains nasty passages, resembles the fact that the *Summa Theologica* of St. Aquinas, and other important works of Christian theology, contain nasty passages. There is nothing *intrinsic* to Judaism that requires all Jews to believe in these passages - any more than a good Christian must believe the opinions of medieval theologians in favor of burning heretics at the stake. There is simply no comparison to the Koran, which Islam holds to be the *literal* words of God Himself, in which He imposes a Divine obligation on every Muslim to wage holy war against non-Muslims, making Islam intrinsically hostile to Britain.

Naturally, any Jew who really does believe in the racist anti-gentile passages, is a genuine enemy of ours, and should be opposed. But such people are rare, as these passages are obscure and few Jews read them. Most Jews don't even read the Talmud, which is only of interest to the religiously orthodox, and most enemy Jews of our time have been fanatical secularists like Karl Marx.

Other aspects of Jewish religion sometimes found objectionable mainly concern the desire of the Jews to keep themselves separate, with a distinct ethnic identity, while living in foreign nations. As nationalists ourselves, we





accept their right to do so on two conditions: first, that they accept that our right to protect *our* identity is as valid as their right to protect theirs, and second, that they do not protect their identity in a manner that harms us.

In particular, British Jews must not undermine their status as persons assimilated to our nation, i.e. ethnically different, strictly speaking, but *sufficiently* similar that this difference is too small to give legitimate grounds for offence. British Jews have a long history of being better assimilated, and more loyal, than Jews in other countries, like Russia and the USA, and it is good for us, and good for them, that they should stay this way.

### THE JUDEO-OBSESSIVE

Three things identify a Judeo-obsessive:

1. The idea all Jews are evil.
2. The idea everything Jews do is evil.
3. The idea all our problems come from the Jews.

The idea that all Jews are evil is simply not supported by real evidence, and contradicted by the many Jews who

have done us good. Let us take three examples. First, it was Benjamin Disraeli, Britain's great Victorian Jewish Prime Minister, who made a key issue of race. He wrote:

*"No one may treat the principle of race, the racial question, with indifference, for it is the key to world history. History is often confusing for the sole reason that it is written by people who know neither the racial issue nor the moments connected therewith."*

"All is race, there is no other truth."  
Nationalists will also find much to agree with in the writings of Sir Alfred Sherman, now in his mid-eighties. Born the son of a Jewish immigrant in East London, he was a Communist in early life. It took him a decade "before I realised what a cheat and liar Stalin was". He became a right-wing Conservative, a co-founder of the Centre for Policy Studies, and a force behind Margaret Thatcher. For twenty years, he has consistently strongly opposed the immigration open door policy and has been a critic of the multiculturalism and the Islamic threat.

Also recall the wonderful 'Peter Simple' (Michael Wharton), the master of satire who exposed the sham of

multiculturalism and the Marxist penetration of the establishment for nearly 50 years in his column in the *Daily Telegraph* until his death at 92 earlier this year. His real name was Michael Bernard Nathan and he was of German-Jewish origin. Nick Griffin and I both had the pleasure of corresponding with him in his latter years.

These examples show that the idea that everything Jews do is evil is where Judeo-obsessives lose touch with reality, because in order to maintain this, they must interpret every Jewish action as part of a grand plan for world domination. They can't admit a Jew would ever do anything good, or there goes their theory, so they have to interpret any contrary evidence as proof of the ability of the Jews to fake contrary evidence in order to cover their tracks! But if that's true, then all history is a giant hologram, projected by the Jews to further their diabolical aims, and no fact can be relied upon. And the Jews must have quasi-magical powers to manipulate people, at which point Judeo-obsessivism slides into outright fairy-tale.


The idea that *all* our problems come from the Jews is perhaps the most dangerous, because it blinds one to these problems' real origin, making it impossible to fight them effectively. Judeo-obsessives go blind to things like the nation-liquidating propensities of modern capitalism. After all, the capitalists aren't to blame - the Jews are! People who are congenitally naive about the treacherousness of capitalism, like American followers of David Duke, are particularly prone to this.

There is no vast Jewish 'conspiracy' responsible for our nation's predicament. I made this clear in 1999 in my book *Many Shades of Black*:

*'There was no conspiracy by Jewish international finance to destroy our power and to open the floodgates to Afro-Asian immigration... It's a theory that leaks like a sieve.'*

Judeo-obsessivism blinds nationalists to the treachery our own people are capable of. Tony Blair has done this country ten times more harm than every Jewish Marxist who ever lived in Britain, but he is a nice British boy. Similarly with George Bush.

None of this is to deny, of course, that Jews like Paul Wolfowitz, who



**BENJAMIN DISRAELI: A key figure in the building of the British Empire**





engineered a war in which British soldiers are dying to prop up a New World Order that plans the liquidation of Britain, are complete bastards. But who gives men like this the power to engineer wars? They obviously couldn't do it on their own, without the cooperation of our gentile rulers. If bad Jews bribe our gentile rulers, who accepts these bribes? If bad Jews bully our gentile rulers, why are they such wimps that they give in to it?

In fact, we can't help noticing that, just as medieval kings used to employ Jews as tax collectors, so they could divert peasant anger into anti-Jewish riots, something similar may be going on here. The anti-Semitic hysteria over the Iraq war certainly has taken quite a bit of heat off of certain higher-ups, hasn't it now? How many people, who ought to be baying for the impeachment of Bush and Blair, are howling instead about how the Jews snookered them into it? The real powers are quite likely laughing their heads off.

### THE REAL CONSPIRACY

Consider the drive for world government, the liquidation of nations, the subordination of societies to faceless global capitalism, the destruction of distinct cultures and peoples, and the end of their democratic self-determination. And suppose that the people behind it really are Bush, Blair, the United Nations, the Trilateral Commission, the Davos gang, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, the Council on Foreign Relations, etc. the usual suspects, in other words.

*Wouldn't it be awfully convenient to keep nationalists baying about The International Jew instead?*

Thus the true powers behind globalism (which of course includes some Jews) could guarantee that nationalist movements are ghettoised, preach only to the converted, and are thereby doomed to failure.

There's a very simple reason there can't be a giant Jewish conspiracy to rule the world. If there were, do you really imagine all the other greedy and powerful people in the world would just say to its Jewish masters, 'OK, gents. You can have it. Take over the world. Be our guests.' Of course not. They'd want in. Being powerful, they'd get in.

Therefore:

*Is there a vast Jewish conspiracy? No, it's much worse. They're all in on it.*

It's clear the nexus of global power - call it a conspiracy if you like, so long as you don't get silly about it - has a Jewish faction. But it also has a Catholic faction, an American faction, and British, French, German, Mexican and Arabian factions. This is for the simple reason that there exist Jews, Catholics, Americans, Britons, Frenchmen, Germans, Mexicans and Arabs who think they're going to get money and power out of it.


### WE HAVEN'T SOLD OUT

Lest anyone misunderstand, the BNP has not 'embraced Zionism', 'sold out to the Jews', or anything like it. We remain well-aware that subversive Jews exist, that some Jews tend to have a characteristic style of (materialistic and scheming, like Karl Marx and George Soros) subversion, and we remain committed to fighting them, *when this is really the case*. But

it is an entirely different matter to say that some Jews make themselves, by their behaviour, the enemies of our people, and to say that all Jews, simply because they are Jews, are the enemy.

We do believe it is the morally right thing, but our reformed Jewish policy also works to the BNP's political benefit. We gain nothing by attacking Jews who are not actually our enemies and there are key drawbacks to doing so. If Jews know they'll be attacked by the BNP whether they misbehave or not, they will have no incentive to behave. They will feel they have no choice, for their own survival, but to fight tooth-and-nail against our party. Even if, minus the anti-Semitism, they like much of what we have to say. The mere fact of our opposition to the Muslim threat, which lusts to wipe them off the face off the earth, guarantees some do.

If we attacked all Jews, this would give people the wrong idea of what the BNP is about. Because we have had some anti-Semitic extremism in our





past, attacking all Jews would make the public think this is what we stand for today. It would give the upper hand to hidden dinosaurs among nationalists around the world, who don't understand our new ideological model, and sabotage our necessary project of either converting them or putting maximum distance between us.

If we attacked all Jews, this would waste our finite energies attacking imaginary enemies when we have very real ones to worry about. The war we are engaged in is a matter of national survival. If it were not, Judeo-obsessivism would still be a mistake, but perhaps one we could afford. As things are, it is not. Our energies must be devoted to real enemies only.

### STAY OUT OF MIDEAST TROUBLE

The BNP's position on the Middle East is very simple:

*Britain should not be a party to other people's wars.*

This does not mean that Britain ought to have absolutely nothing to do with Middle Eastern countries. A BNP government would continue normal commercial relations, air travel routes, counter-terrorist cooperation, etc. But it would not let Britain become party to the *political* conflicts between nations in the Middle East - any more than we are to the conflicts between China and Taiwan, or India and Pakistan. We would not take sides.

This does not mean we believe that the two sides of the Arab-Israeli conflict (or Arab-Persian, Arab-Kurd, or intra-Arab conflicts) are morally equivalent. We simply do not take a position on who is right. 'Moral equivalence' is the *least* advantageous position for us to take, in terms of the friends and enemies it makes us, because *both* sides would be annoyed at being told their position was morally equivalent to that of their enemies.

The purpose of foreign policy is not to render moral judgments about foreign countries, it is to protect our nation's interests, and our interests are best protected by staying out of other people's wars. So we will not take ideological stands that could be used to construct a case for our involvement on *either* side.

In regard to the question of Israel's right to exist, we are well-aware that Israel was founded at the point of a gun, on land formerly inhabited by



ISLAMIC TERRORISM: A threat to Britain as well as Israel

other people. But so were the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, South Africa, and many other countries. Even, if you go back far enough in history, countries you wouldn't expect, like Japan and the Arab states outside Arabia. So there is no basis for singling out Israel. It is an internationally-recognised state, a member of the UN, and to deny its right to exist is a bizarre and ultra-Arab position.

Would such recognition violate our policy of not taking sides? No, because a future BNP government would either have to recognise Israel, as all normal countries do, or join Syria, Saudi Arabia and a few other Muslim fanatic states in refusing. It is not possible to be neutral concerning recognition: one either does or doesn't, the default position is to recognise, and Britain has no imaginable reason to side with Muslim fanatics. 'Not taking sides in other people's conflicts' means treating the parties to such conflicts like other normal countries.

Concerning recognition of a possible 'Palestinian' state: the BNP has absolutely no desire to take the Arab side by actually *pushing* for the creation of such a state. It is not Britain's business to draw the borders of the Middle East, and we oppose the current attempts of the EU to drag Britain into the conflict on the Arab side by funding the Palestinian Authority

and its government of admitted Islamists and terrorists. But *if* such a state comes about, and ends up being recognised by most other nations in the world, given a seat in the UN, and acquiring the other attributes of a normal country, then we will accept this as *fait accompli*. Just as we - and most of the rest of the world - will accept whatever is the outcome of the Taiwan-China conflict, or the Indo-Pakistani conflict over Kashmir.

The left-wing canard that 'Zionism is racism' - or even quasi-Nazi - is false. (Having been ideological extremists of similar stripe ourselves at one time, we know whereof we speak here.) Zionism is just another nationalism, of which there are as many in the world as there are ethnic groups to espouse them. Nobody considers it illegitimate when the Japanese, Zulus, or Costa Ricans do it.

Considered as pure ideology, Zionism is no more or less objectionable than anyone else's nationalism. Considered as applied ideology, this gets into all the rights and wrongs of the Middle East, and as we said, it is neither our responsibility, nor in our national interest, to take a position on these questions. Our only concern is whether Zionism harms Britain, so if Zionists will accept we won't fight their wars for them, and don't start claiming God gave them Shropshire, the rest does not concern us.





# Britain's Incompatibility With The European Mindset

» *Robert Dewar explains that the drive towards the European super-state represents the alienation of our liberty and our sovereignty*

» Our Anglo Saxon political heritage is totally at odds with the political mindset which prevails in Europe. This is why the European Leaders - Merkel of German, Chirac of France, Prodi of Italy, and even Norman Lowell, Leader of Malta's New Right - not only find it easy and logical to work towards a European supra-state, but cannot begin to understand why we Anglo Saxons must be so awkward about accepting European sovereignty. The vast gulf which separates our two understandings of the part an overarching European government should play in the nations' lives, is due to our very different politico-cultural heritages.

Not only does Europe have a folk-memory of the three "Golden Ages", when all of Europe was united under one rule - first under Rome, next under Charlemagne, then under the German-led Holy Roman Empire - but the European nations have no history or comprehension of democracy British-style, which recognises that power stems from the People, who lend certain powers to their government; powers which can be rescinded by Parliament, rather than vice-versa as in Europe. In the latter power descends from above; the government bestowing only such liberties upon the people as it chooses, and such governments always reserving the right to withdraw these liberties at any time.

## FOLK MEMORY

Our British Folk memory centres on the great periods of our struggle against tyranny or foreign domination: our folk heroes are those who defended our Anglo Saxon liberties, or led us in our fight against invasion.

Alfred the Great led us against the Norsemen, and was the first English King to fight with a navy. King John was forced to grant the Magna Carta in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the basis of our evolved constitution, in which state powers are checked by certain inalienable rights afforded the people. Elizabeth I embodied the fierce patriotism and anti-European spirit which England displayed when her pirate-sailors, Drake, Hawkins and others, pummelled the Spanish Armada, saving England from becoming a province of the Spanish-Habsburg Holy Roman Empire; in fact just another Catholic country. Winston Churchill, that most quintessentially English modern hero, symbolised a nation alone against the might of Europe, and despite all the odds being stacked against us, we Britons triumphed under his inspiring, no-nonsense leadership against domination by an evil pan-European power.

Only once within our history as an Anglo Saxon nation has England been successfully invaded. We all know that in 1066 our last English King, Harold, died in battle and the Norman bastard, William Duke of Normandy, became king



of England, initiating 400 years of rule by kings who spoke little or no English, many of whom saw their principal power bases as European, and who shed good English blood to fight their European wars. Under the later Tudors and then the Stuarts we left Europe to its own confused devices, for the most part; with the loss of our final European holding, Calais, in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. We became instead a sea-faring nation, seeking wealth, adventure and glory first in piracy and then in trade all around the globe. From this anti-European bias came the fulfilment of our world-destiny as we founded our far-flung Empire, the greatest the world has ever known, and possibly the most benign.

In Europe religious and political wars raged across the Continent, their central theme being attempts by one power or another to unite and dominate all of Europe. There were no long periods of peace during which a truly democratic tradition could evolve; in the one modern European state with a centuries-old tradition of liberty, Switzerland, we find a country at the heart of Europe which





refuses to join the EU, yet trades advantageously with the rest of Europe and counts its citizens as Europe's wealthiest.

France speaks often of "Liberty", but she fails to comprehend this term as we do in Britain; liberty in Britain is that which pertains to each individual, with Parliament its guardian; liberty in France is at best a perverted form of meritocracy in which those with power delegate its misuse to the professional body of "fonctionnaires" whose misuse of power exceeds even that of the typical British bureaucrat; European bureaucrats use their power to trample on the individual's rights and freedoms. It is not for nothing that detention without trial is the norm in France (and in many other European criminal justice systems), whilst in Britain, until recently (for New Labour is rapidly eroding our judicial heritage), "habeas corpus", the Anglo Saxon principal that one cannot be held without being charged and speedily tried by one's peers, has for hundreds of years maintained the individual's liberty against the state. It is not for nothing that on the Continent, Napoleonic Law (which pertains in most western European countries) assumes the individual guilty from the start of the legal process set in motion against him.

### ELECTIVE DICTATORSHIP

The political system in France and in many other European countries today is virtually that of an elective dictatorship, in which laws are made from on high rather than stemming from the people; where rule by decree is the norm rather than otherwise. This concept is foreign to the British political system, despite New Labour's steady attack against the principle that power stems from the people, most recently and worryingly in the form of the Legislative and Regulatory Reform bill currently making its quiet way through a quiescent Parliament, largely unreported by the Media (why is this?) which will vastly increase Ministers' powers to initiate, amend and rescind legislation without reference to Parliament. Taken together with the greatly increased powers of monitoring and surveillance of the individual the state will gain, once chip and pin, biometric ID cards become compulsory, this bill constitutes the single most sinister attack on our

Constitution since the 17<sup>th</sup> century. Our constitution (for we do have one; it consists in a body of agreements between the people and the state, in a wealth of legislation, and in Common Law), is all about checks and balances. It is about the responsibility of the state towards the people, rather than - as in Europe - the responsibility of the people towards the state.

It can be seen that for Britain to recognise EU authority, above all in the judicial sphere but also in the economic sphere, is for Britain to make a gift of the sovereignty she has fought for hundreds of years to maintain, and to make this gift to a European authority whose political tenets are deeply inimical with those which define our British political and cultural heritage. Yet this is precisely what is happening. Our judiciary is no longer independent, for we are bound by treaty to recognise the authority of tens of thousands of EU directives over our own laws, and we must recognise too the authority of the European Court of Justice above that of our own supreme court of appeal, the Lords. Economically the Chancellor is bound through treaty in so many areas to subdue British economic imperatives to those defined as of European concern by the EU, that we have in effect lost our sovereignty completely.

Sovereignty is defined above all by a nation's ability to govern itself without outside interference according to its own laws; after that, sovereignty resides in a nation's right in international law to pursue freely its economic interests as it sees fit. We in Britain have neither of these rights. By any definition our politicians have, since Maastricht, been engaging in treason, *for they have handed over what is not theirs to give away: our sovereignty.*

I have shown that sovereignty resides not in the state but in the People, who loan various powers to the state as they see will bring about best governance on behalf of them, the people. Since the mid seventies, our various governments have shifted increasingly, step by small step, largely unnoticed by the people, towards the European political model, where all sovereignty, being understood to reside in the state, can be alienated by government without reference to the people as represented by Parliament.

*Government, having stolen our birthright, which is Liberty, has given it away by incremental degrees to a power, the EU, which in its Continental tradition embodies all that is most to be resisted if Britain is to defend her sovereignty and freedom!*

In international law, it is already too late for Britain to regain her sovereignty, for our governments have signed various treaties with the EU in which no provision is made for them to be rescinded, from which we cannot legally withdraw. This means that if we are to regain our sovereignty, we must in effect act unilaterally without reference to treaty obligations or to international law (as defined by the European Court of Justice), and seize back our alienated birthright, if necessary using the threat of force to back this attempt. Can it be for nothing that the same government which is actively working towards Britain's complete and effective submission to Europe, has also visited so many cuts upon our Armed forces - *especially upon our Navy, the traditional guarantor of our freedom* - that it may be already too late for us to back our claim to that which has been stolen from us?





# BOOK REVIEW: Necessary Words

» By Jonathon Bowden

With this poetical work, *Necessary Words*, Tong joins a number of relatively unknown National poets like Dick Cardmore (possibly a pseudonym for *Right Now's* Derek Turner), Michael Cope and Steven Taylor. All in all, these verses are a poeticisation of various articles in *Voice of Freedom*. For example, *Necessary Words*, the title refrain, deals with the unassailable nature of English identity. Whereas the next scald in, *Feeding the Pigeons*, laments the universalism of a charity which forgets everything happening here. Does it take reference from the fact that Mayor Ken Livingstone's banned feeding the pigeons in Trafalgar Square but Hizb ut-Tahrir regularly meets there?

## ALIENATION

Where *In a Strange Land* and *My Home* both analyse the disorientation and alienation of the English as their country becomes 14% non-white. Poems as diverse as *The Arbiters*, *Observing the English*, *To a Hostel Warden* and *A Commonwealth Conference Photograph* then make an appearance. All of them dissect media distortion and lies, moral laziness, hypocrisy and a sort of Middle English blindness. Mister Tong's essential point, in these stanzas, seems to be an attack on the milksop ethics of the philosopher G.E. Moore, and the liberal platitudes they evince.

*St. John and St. Anselm*, *Triolet for St. John's* and *An Anglican Bishop* emerge in the book's middle section. They confer an obviously Christian and Anglican identity



BNP Cultural Officer Jonathon Bowden


on the poet, but definitely of a militant and rather Evangelical hue. In these works our bard is adopting a muscular Christian tone, redolent of Victorian and Imperial devines, yet alienated from documents like "Faith in the City". Perhaps there's more than a hint of Sir Henry Newbolt here...

*Televised Protest*, *Other Eden*, *In Another's Place* and *Stamp Issues* are verses towards the book's second half. They rehearse and extend already visited themes. These strophes choose to look at Japanese cultural imperialism, Anglo-Saxon aimlessness and the 'Right to Shop', together with the luxury of Animal rights at a time when one's society is in free fall. Four other staves – *The Great Storm*, *Bosworth 1485*, *On the Statue of Oliver Cromwell at Westminster* and *Milton 1660* – adopt a new tone. These lyrics wax more historical, rooted, vanguardist and cross-referenced than before. While the mention of the Lord Protector and the Commonwealth's Minister of Latin (i.e. foreign secretary) gives an English Protestant and heroic demeanour to Tong's efforts.

## PASTORAL TEMPERAMENT

Alternatively, *Gulls* and *The Pond* embody a more pastoral and evergreen temperament – a rallying cry to the fact that our poet is an English version of R.S. Thomas' aboriginal cymric. *Figures on a Desolate Landscape* and *After the Explosion*, however, seem more urgent and restless. Could our versifier be a New Apocalyptic without knowing it?

Finally we need to end this review by concentrating on two bardic offerings. They carry the titles of *An English Prayer* and *I Let it Happen* respectively. The first happens to be a 'politically incorrect' liturgy reminiscent of the Reverend Robert West's delivery. The second reads like a moderate *cri de Coeur* towards the author's lack of nationalist action.



£8 (inc. p&p)

For ordering information, see opposite page





May 2006

Merchandise

# English & Proud Wristbands

**£1.50 (inc. p&p)**

## Bulk rates:

10-49: 80p each

50-99: 70p each

100-499: 55p each

500+: 50p each

All bulk rates are sent post free.

Since their release we have sold thousands of these wristbands. Some units bought them in time for Saint Georges day and sold hundreds at public events, and with the World Cup approaching there is huge scope for these wristbands to be sold to the public. Whether you buy them through your local unit or as an individual, the profit to be made on these is huge. Whether you sell them in pubs, on the street, or take them to Germany and sell them at the World Cup itself, these wristbands are sure to go down a treat. Please order now to avoid disappointment.




With embossed 'English and Proud' lettering and printed Saint George flag design on rear.



**England Expects**  
**£14.99 (inc. p&p)**

**East Ended**  
**£13.99 (inc. P&p)**



# Excalibur

[www.excaliburheritage.com](http://www.excaliburheritage.com) - 07074 532 267



Please make all cheques payable to "Excalibur" and send to PO Box 116, Leeds, LS27 9WW. When ordering please clearly specify which item you require

## England Expects - With Nelson To Victory DVD

England Expects is a beautifully shot and detailed biopic of Admiral Lord Nelson, the foremost in a long line of British Naval heroes. It is also a celebration of his life, timed to coincide with the 200th anniversary of his death at the moment of his greatest glory, the Battle of Trafalgar. Made on location across England and following in Nelson's footsteps to the places with which he was most familiar, the film is presented by Nick Griffin and Eddy Butler, and also features Jonathan Bowden.

## Eastended - The Decline and Fall of the East End DVD

The first commercially produced DVD from BNPTv. Running time is 55mins and tells the story of the white working class community in London's East End from the turn of the 20th century to the present day.





# John Bean's Nationalist Notebook

## Deport All Foreign Criminals

By the time this issue is printed we may well see the departure of the two leading Cabinet Ministers, Charles Clarke and John Prescott. The former has proved to be even more incompetent as a Home Secretary than his predecessor, David Blunkett, and the latter, the mentally dyslexic lothario of a Deputy Prime Minister, has at least given consolation to those who are fat and well past their sell-by-date that they can still "pull the birds".

The Home Secretary's incompetence underlines the fact that this government does not really have an immigration policy. Its drive to import potential voters (80% of Blacks and 70% of Asians vote Labour) is a national disaster, of which the release of 1,023 foreign criminals who had supposed to have been deported represents the tip of a multicultural iceberg. We are talking here of murderers, rapists, sex offenders, drug runners and violent robbers.

Clarke suggested that the problem had arisen because the Home Office, the Prison Service and the Immigrant and Nationality Directorate had failed to cope with a huge growth in foreign prisoners in England and Wales: from 4,259 in June 1996 to 10,265 out of a total of 76,670 at the end of February this year. However, it was later stated that this total could be in excess of 11,000, plus 600 who were claiming to be British subjects. In other words, one prisoner in seven is a foreign citizen. This does not, of course, take into account those prisoners who were originally immigrants but have become "British subjects" by one means or another.

A breakdown of the deportees who have disappeared into the woodwork shows 175 were from Jamaica, 59 from Nigeria, 58 from Iraq, 48 from Somalia, 45 Pakistan, 42 from Algeria, and 237 were failed asylum seekers.

Although opposition leaders called for Clarke to resign, many of the foreign prisoners started their sentences under a Tory government. We should not forget that it was more than a decade of Tory misrule that allowed hundreds of thousands of migrants to enter Britain under revised immigration legislation. It was Michael Howard who introduced the term "asylum seeker" following the Immigration Act of 1993. And 'Dave Boy' and his Notting Hill chums have made it perfectly clear that immigration is not on their list of problems to be tackled. On the contrary, Cameron has unveiled plans to transform the party by ensuring that a tenth of candidates in winnable seats are from ethnic minorities. *Daily Telegraph*, 26.04.06.

## Labour Lie on Immigrant Costs Demolished

*Identity* has published figures on several occasions in the past (e.g. "Nationalist Notebook", January 2006) to show that the claim that immigrants contribute more to the economy than they receive in benefits is another

Labour lie. A study by the respected independent MigrationWatch UK organisation completely demolishes Labour's claim, which has previously been supported by the Lib Dems and the Cameronlite Tories. The study says that immigrants are a minimum £200 million cost to the economy annually.

Importantly, MigrationWatch accuses Whitehall of using "entirely false" methodology to back up its claims that immigrants contribute £2.5bn more to the economy than they receive in benefits by failing to take full account of the children of immigrants. Children of "mixed" households, those who had one UK-born parent (usually of immigrant stock) and one foreign-born parent, were attributed entirely to the native population. This meant that in these "mixed" households, the cost of all the children was attributable to the UK-born parent and none of the costs fell to the new immigrant community. As there are some 1.4 million children of "mixed" households, MigrationWatch said this had "a decisive effect" on the result.

The pure fiction of immigrants making a £2.5bn net contribution to the economy was born in a so-called research paper issued by the Home Office in 2002, which said that although immigrants cost £28.8 bn in welfare benefits and state services that year, they contributed £31.2 bn in taxes. Now what the BNP has said, including in its 2005 Election Manifesto, is that many thousands of these "immigrants" who have paid high taxes are in fact American and European nationals working in very high paid jobs in banking, insurance and City financial jobs in general - hardly illiterate Somalis or Pakistani villagers! This point has not been raised by MigrationWatch or elsewhere to our knowledge.

## A Million Immigrants Last Year

Nearly a million immigrants came to Britain last year, which is far more than official figures admit. This claim was made last month by the respected City forecaster Capital Economics. Its report backed up the BNP's contention that the true number of migrants from Poland and Eastern Europe and the full levels of illegal immigration have been left out of the Government's figures. It also divulged that the Foreign Office has said that visa applications are likely to pass the three million point over the next two years.

Estimating the real scale of immigration last year at between 830,000 and 976,000, the report said that around 350,000 were likely to have left the country. This meant a net increase of more than 500,000; more than double the official tally of 223,000.

Few people have objections to the Poles and other Baltics as such except, as the Capital reports makes clear, that they are undercutting our own workers' wage levels, plus the fact that we are just full up. When Romania and Bulgaria join the EU next year Britain, unlike all the other older member countries, will again give them free entry. It will not be a repetition of our



friendly Polish plumbers (perhaps given to drinking too much vodka at week-ends), but a surfeit of Romanian gypsies.

Now the local elections are out of the way, we can expect Government sources to again start flying a kite for giving an amnesty for half a million illegal immigrants, thereby suggesting that Labour is doing something about immigration. Not many people realise that the Home Office has already given an amnesty to around 100,000 asylum seekers over the past 30 months.

### Persecution of BNP Drama Teacher

A contributory factor to the growing professionalism of the BNP website's BNPTV has been the part played by Emma Chamberlain as the presenter of most of the latest interviews and features. Emma, who has written for *Identity* on the art of public speaking, has worked for the past four years as a drama co-ordinator at the Astor Theatre Arts Centre in Deal. Her work included teaching children aged from four to 14. She has now become the victim of a witch-hunt, instigated by Gwyn Prosser, the Labour MP for Dover and Deal, and sacked by the theatre.

Prosser began his campaign against Emma Chamberlain with the statement: "I look upon the BNP as an evil, right-wing, fascist organisation. Anyone that espouses the beliefs of that party should not have anything to do with young people. If my child were in that class (taught by Miss Chamberlain), I would take them out immediately."

It is not just the bile from Prosser the Tosser (as he is referred to by the politically incorrect) that has led to this persecution, but the prominent part in the witch hunt played by the *Dover Express* which is owned by Trinity Mirror plc - no friends of the BNP! This group publishes over 75 local papers in London and the south east and it acts as a pro-Marxist propaganda front for New Labour, and any dissidents, even when their political beliefs are completely separate from their jobs, will be attacked. Having lost two jobs in my distant past because of my political beliefs, I can empathise with Emma Chamberlain. If any reader can suggest how we can help her regain employment, please contact me.

### Searchlight Leopards Do Not Change Their Marxist Spots

It is further proof of our contention that there is little to choose between the three old parties, that even the Tories Deputy Chairman, Eric Pickles MP, admitted that they were working hand in glove with the Labour-funded Marxist *Searchlight* gang to peddle lies about the BNP. The Tory press, *Daily Telegraph*, *Mail*, and the former Tory supporting red top, *The Sun*, gave the *Searchlight* exaggerations and outright lies another airing, but I believe that they are now subject to the law of diminishing returns. They may have led to a few BNP candidates receiving good runner-up votes instead of winning at this month's elections, but it is now unlikely to

do this again as long as BNP candidates chosen are checked for absence of skeletons in cupboards.

New readers may wonder whether we are exaggerating when we refer to *Searchlight* being a gang of Marxist criminals. Believe me, we are not. I have been around in nationalist politics for more than fifty years. And I knew the East London Jewish Marxists who gave birth to *Searchlight*. Some of those who were not standing as Communist Party Candidates (Gerry Gable stood for Stepney), were involved in drug dealing, whilst the spiritual father of the 62 Group (from which *Searchlight* sprang), Harry Bidney had convictions for living on immoral earnings of prostitutes, and had a liking for young boys.

Gerry Gable, *Searchlight's* leading senior citizen, has a conviction for burglary. Therefore, I often wonder whether it definitely was his voice I heard when a 62 Group gang tried to break into my house back in 1962.

I thought of this when I was being interviewed by the BBC for my comments on the affects of immigration in the late 50s, which was shown in the BBC 2 programme on April 8<sup>th</sup> "Who Killed My Brother - Kelso Cochrane". At that time I ran a nationalist party called the National Labour Party, calling for a halt to immigration. To make sure I was not being "stitched up", I got a friend to obtain copies of the Special Branch report, released under the 30-year rule, covering the murder of Cochrane, a West Indian, in May 1959. Here are some extracts:

"On 31.5.59 the *Sunday Pictorial* printed a story which stated that a youth named Gordon Lewis claimed that the murder of Cochrane was the result of a publicity stunt, organised by anti-coloured political groups to attract attention to their meetings.

"The previous evening Lewis, accompanied by a *Sunday Pictorial* crime reporter, had called at Harrow Road Police Station, and made a 'confession' in which he alleged that the National Labour Party was the organisation behind the murder, but he had no facts to support his allegation.

"Special Branch enquiries revealed that Lewis lived next door to and was very friendly with Benjamin Franklyn Levene. Levene had come to notice on numerous occasions as a hoaxer, whose modus operandi is to tell the press sensational but false stories in the hope of payment. Lewis was interviewed and made a written confession that his statements to the *Sunday Pictorial* and to police regarding the murder were completely false."

The point of this trip down my memory lane, is that in 1962 a Bernard Levine was a member of the 62 Group and if it was the same person then it again shows that 62 Group-*Searchlight* leopards do not change their Marxist spots.

Incidentally, for any cynic who may believe that I have only become "moderate" in my old age, here is another extract from the Special Branch Report: "The National Labour Party held a meeting on 13.6.59 at Queensway, W.2. Up to 70 persons were present to hear John Bean emphasise that the policy of his party was not anti-racial or violent - his party 'just wanted this country to remain white'."

Sorry I was not exactly successful: not enough of your fathers and mothers would listen to me.





May 2006

Readers' Letters

# Speakers' Corner

PO Box 97, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 1WT, England. E-mail: [identitymatters@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:identitymatters@yahoo.co.uk)

## LETTER OF THE MONTH

### >> New Bill's Threat to Democracy

I have been reading with increased incredulity and anger the details in the Government's new Legislative and Regulatory Reform Bill (LRRB). Behind this rather boring sounding bill lies a horrific threat to our democracy and I would urge the BNP to make this a major issue. It could threaten the existence of the BNP itself.

The LRRB allows any government minister to change a law or bill without discussing it in Parliament. It just requires their signature and that's that! Although the Bill does have some restrictions, imagine the following scenario:

The Bill is passed (with no Tory or Lib Dem opposition) and Tony Blair immediately uses the LRRB to amend the LRRB itself, thereby stripping out all of the restrictions. The Home Secretary then uses the revamped Bill to amend the Race Relations Act, banning all political parties that do not support the multicultural society or European integration. The BNP is immediately banned and its leaders subject to arrest. After lunch, he amends the Representation of the People Act to say that elections (at all levels) can be suspended in the event of a 'national crisis' and amends the Terrorism Act to allow the Home Secretary (himself) to decide what constitutes a national crisis. Once the ink is dry, he declares a national crisis and good bye to elections.

Several centuries of painfully-won parliamentary democracy could be undone in a day! Parliament is by-passed and becomes irrelevant. The possibilities are endless.

Nic Wright  
e-mail

### >> The Smoking Ban

In his article on the smoking ban last month Derek Adams sounds like a typical capitalist. As I am sure he is aware, smoking causes cancer and in an enclosed area his staff and non-smoking customers have no choice but to breathe in other people's smoke.

He says that many pubs and clubs will have to close. The evidence from New York proves differently, as one year after the 2003 Smoke Free Air Act banning smoking in all workplaces came into effect business receipts for restaurants and bars increased by 8.7%. Also, surveys over the years have consistently shown that around 70% of smokers say they want to quit but many find it hard to do so. The

smoking ban should help boost the resolve of those who are desperate to quit their deadly addiction.

James Mole  
Lutterworth, Leics

### >> What's Behind The Media Promotion?

So what was last month's media-wide 'promotion' of the BNP all about? Some said it was a 'scare tactic' to make Labour supporters go out and vote. If so, I think they scored an own-goal, whatever the election results.

1. The media pointed out all of the failings of New Labour, and likewise highlighted our support for British workers interests (clearly a 'non-racist' policy).
2. Effectively, the media has publicly

said, in most papers and on all TV channels, that you can now legitimately consider voting BNP. Thus what started out as a 'scare tactic' has actually legitimised the BNP in everyone's eyes!

3. Any publicity is good publicity.

Ralph Ellis  
Chester

### >> People Are Awakening

I have just looked at my Sky News text channel and for the second night running there is news about the BNP. But this is real news, not the old anti-BNP news! I feel that our people are awakening, as former Conservative and Labour voters realise that the old parties have given away our country to immigrants, as well as our jobs.

We may be on the threshold of a big breakthrough, if not this year, then next. Keep up the good work everyone.

D. Kendall  
Portsmouth

### >> Ex-Servicemen Are Low Priority

I am an ex-serviceman who worked hard throughout my life. Two years ago I had a heart attack and, being unable to work, had to go on benefit even though I hated doing it. I applied for a War Pension and DLA to help me out but up to now I have been refused and have to live on a basic sixty pounds odd a week. You can imagine how galling I find it when I personally see that asylum seekers and other immigrants are given everything they desire almost immediately upon arrival in this country, without ever doing a stroke of work to merit it!

We are becoming a minority race within our own country. It would seem that the reason why the three main parties welcome the immigrants with open arms is that they think they will



get more votes by doing this. Meanwhile, as anyone can see, whole districts of our towns and cities have now been taken over by immigrants and are being turned into slums. They are also the major contributors to the rise in gun crime and drug 'culture'.

Would these newcomers stand up and fight for us if a conflict such as the Second World War was ever to happen again? A few might, but not the majority. They would either leave as soon as possible or you would have fundamental extremists causing terrorist actions in our country. How much longer can the British Government keep on treating us true British as mushrooms, keeping us in the dark and feeding us with bullshit!

Garry Martin  
E-mail

### >> Defending Our Christian Heritage

Nothing makes our traitorous opponents more irate than saying the BNP seeks to defend our shared Christian heritage and values. They know this completely undermines their unsuccessful attempts to smear us with the 'Nasty Nazi' brush.

It also strongly links us to the defence of the British souls in the face of foreign 'infidels', which began with King Arthur and continued like a golden thread through King Alfred, Richard the Lionheart, Good Queen Bess, Winston Churchill and Enoch himself.

When we raise the Union Jack we are lifting up the Flag of the Saints and standing on the shoulders of our Christian giants. When God is for us, who can stand against us?

Dr Paul Rimmer  
Liverpool

### >> IRA's Latest Murder

The IRA has destroyed all its arms and given up violence. All its bombers, murderers and thieves have become decent hard-working lads. Of course they have.

That's why self-confessed Sinn Fein spy Denis Donaldson was found last month killed by shotgun and his right hand hacked off. Mr Donaldson

had attempted to slip away from his past life as an informer for the British Government but was tracked down by thugs who executed him.

We can be assured that this gruesome act will not stand in the way of former IRA officers being welcomed to top table talks with the government. They will once again be installed in public office by "Our Tone" as sure as night follows day!

P.J. O'Sullivan  
Irish Guards (Retd), Birmingham

### >> New Labour's 'Fascism'

Reference Nick Griffin's article "New Labour and the Return of Fascism", in my opinion Blair's economic and social policy owes nothing to the fascist movements of pre-war Europe. The economic conditions then were very different from what they are now, with Italy and Germany having to find solutions to mass unemployment and economic depression. They looked for a way out of this by mobilising the state. The main difference now is that states and nationalism are an encumbrance to the global financial powers, who see the whole world as theirs to exploit.

The so-called economic miracles of India, China and elsewhere in the Far East depend on Western capital and Western markets to sell their products. The same powers were responsible for creating the conditions for the Japanese economic miracle and the Asian tigers, and where are they today in the economic league?

The financial powers have spread their tentacles throughout the world, and I would agree with Nick Griffin in the necessity for a return to national economic and social policies, not only here but throughout all the Western European nations.

M.D.Hughes  
Wrexham

### >> Solving The Water Shortage

Much has been said concerning the diminishing supply of fresh water in the South East of the country. Why not reduce the number of new

consumers immediately by halting the inflow of asylum seekers and immigrants in general?

This simple, economic and effective aid to water conservation would also have many other advantages, but to the best of my knowledge it has yet to be proposed. I wonder why?

P.G.Willis  
Paignton

### >> National Pride

Being British is not a term of convenience, to be taken up by anyone born anywhere. It is a denotation for the British people; it is a cultural, national and racial description.

Multiculturalism is not at all a unifying force, rather it is divisive. It encourages each group to maintain their own cultural identity in competition with other groups and particularly the host group. Laws designed to protect minorities encourage this division and alienate the native population, relegating it to the position of being just another minority.

Leftists have attempted to eradicate the term race altogether and replace it with the vague and misleading term of ethnicity, claiming that anyone living in or born in England can be termed English. This totally ignores the last thousand years and more of English history that gives only one group the right to be termed English. By the same token an Englishman who moves to the Arab Emirates and receives citizenship can never be an Arab.

One should not confuse racial discrimination with the legitimate right of a Briton to employ the term British in its correct sense, as a racial description. Without the use of the term race, or sub-species, how can one describe the differences between a black African, a yellow Chinese, a white European, a brown Arab or an American red Indian? Although it is not politically correct to mention them, racial differences are all too apparent, as much as cultural differences are.

Philip Smeeton  
Norway





# Christianity in Britain: Self Harm or Suicide?

» *Christianity in Britain is collapsing, its leaders are in denial and its adherents downcast. Islam waits impatiently to administer the coup de grace. John Maddox, in this four part article, analyses how the Christian churches have come close to destroying themselves and calls on Christians to back the BNP in its fight for the indigenous culture of our islands.*



» In May 2004, shortly before the local council and European elections, church leaders in the North of England issued a document condemning the policies of the BNP and urging Christians not to vote for them. These church worthies included the Roman Catholic Bishop of Leeds, Arthur Roche, and his Church of England counterpart, Bishop John Packer. They described their document as, 'an historic joint statement' which called on Christians to vote in the elections only for candidates whose policies 'reflect a spirit of inclusive welcome' for people of all races and faiths.

In March of the same year, *Reform*, journal of the United Reform Church, published an article on 'Racism and the Gospel' which attacked the BNP and stated: 'In all of our churches it needs to be made clear that voting BNP is incompatible with the Christian gospel'.

Since then, it has become *de rigueur* for Christian leaders to release statements prior to elections demonising the BNP and urging their flocks (what is left of them) to treat it like a pariah.

So, no Christian love shown to the BNP! Behind such statements lies a social and theological position which has only developed in the churches in

the West over the last forty years or so, effectively in response to, and actually encouraging, mass immigration. And this states that to be a Christian is to be 'tolerant', 'welcoming', 'inclusive' and 'non-judgemental'. In short, it is to value 'diversity'.

However, the BNP with its commitment to the indigenous peoples of the British Isles and their languages, cultures, history and social homogeneity - very embarrassingly, developed *by* and *for* British Christians (the two terms were synonymous) over the centuries - is depicted as the antithesis of these newly-invented Christian values (sometimes unfairly: after all, the BNP values diversity properly understood - i.e. as the patchwork of races, societies and cultures across the globe, and not as the enforced swamping of one people and its culture by the mass invasion of others).

Therefore, the BNP - together with the 800,000 British citizens who voted for it in 2004 - is demonised and ostracised by our church leaders. Which is surprising when one considers that if there is anything which they profess to hate most, it is the demonisation and ostracism of minorities. However, it is apparent that the BNP and its supporters,

considered as a minority (at least for the time being) of the indigenous British population, are not 'included' in these church leaders' 'big tent'.

In fact, the new European Christian orthodoxy is that the ideal society is *not* a Christian society (historically embodied from about AD 800 to the 1960s in the reality of 'Christendom') but a *diverse* society in which Christianity is only one element in a vibrant, colourful, peaceful mix (well, that's the theory!)

But this is to turn roughly 1,200 years of settled Christianity in Britain - history, doctrine and practice - on its head, leaving church leaders in the ludicrous position of arguing that *either* the multicultural, socially and religiously diverse society is what the Christian churches were aiming at all along - which is simply a lie of tremendous proportions, as all the historical records demonstrate; *or* that Christians up to the 1960s were essentially fake Christians - nasty people enforcing misguided theories and practices and effectively betraying their Lord Jesus as founder of their faith.

It is not surprising that people have deserted in millions a religion able to turn on itself and denounce its past members in such a fashion - rather like



a commissar accusing himself of fantastic crimes in the worst excesses of the Soviet show trials in the 1930s!

Of course, a third possibility might be that our Christian leaders in Britain, thoroughly ashamed of themselves for allowing the Christian patrimony of this country to slip through their fingers to be replaced by an aggressive liberal atheism or an even more aggressive Muslim hegemony based on sheer numbers and a hardcore of Islamic militants, and faced with the consequences of uncontrolled mass immigration, have embraced the destruction of Christian society as required by multiculturalism *not* as an absolute good but as a necessary evil which they hope to survive by cowering in the margins.

But this does not explain the enthusiasm and authoritarian zeal with which they are now denouncing and dismantling their own Christian heritage and conniving at its replacement with the alien religious 'heritages' of our uninvited (and particularly Muslim) colonists. So, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it is safer to assume that they really have reneged on the historic faith of their predecessors and have replaced it with an existential secularised code of 'good practice' based on the new cult of 'human rights' rather than the teachings of Jesus Christ.

Let us be clear. Britain has been largely Christian since the seventh

century and, after the Saxon and Viking invasions of the sixth to ninth centuries, wholly Christian until the 1960s. There was a slow but gradual decline in Christian practice from the mid-nineteenth century, but it was only after the 1960s 'revolution', which resulted in the collapse of received values and saw the first results of mass immigration, that the marginalisation of Christianity really began in earnest.

Through those long Christian centuries, despite the Reformation in the sixteenth century and despite all the quarrels, wars and manoeuvres between European states, Europe as a whole saw itself as 'Christendom' - a bastion of the Christian faith whose task was to build and perfect Christian society within its boundaries and be a beacon to the whole world with a mandate from the divine founder of the faith, Jesus Christ himself, to go forth into all the corners of the world and convert other societies, cultures and religions to the Christian revelation, 'baptising in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost'.

Now the bishops and politicised leaders of the Christian churches have effectively censored those words of their own Saviour, replacing them with the new god, 'diversity' in whose name they are happy to accept and indeed enforce a declining minority role for the Christian religion in the UK, 'celebrating' other faiths and ethical codes and falling over backwards on a daily basis to cede territory and

influence (whether it be the sale of churches to be converted into mosques or encouraging the stark and medieval strictures of the Koran and Hadith) to other religions, particularly Islam.

The consequences in the collapse of membership in the Christian churches and their influence in politics and society have been catastrophic - the Church of England now has fewer members at Sunday worship than there are Muslims in the mosques at their Friday prayers - but like men hypnotised the Christian leaders continue doggedly along their path of decline and decay as if locked in a gruesome fandango to see who will have the honour of closing the last door of the last church and handing over the key to the local imam.

### THE NEW INVASION

How on earth has Christianity in Europe ensnared itself in such a mess? It is instructive to compare the Catholic Church's response to the collapse of the Roman Empire in AD 475 with its response, and that of the other Christian churches, to the new invasion of Europe which has been gaining momentum since the mid-1980s. As we know, the Roman Empire did not collapse in a sudden cataclysmic event. Rather, after suffering decades of invasion and settlement by the barbarian peoples of the north which it was too enfeebled to resist, in AD 475 the last Roman emperor was deposed, local rule passed to various barbarian kings and chieftains, and the Pope rapidly became leader and *de facto* ruler of the city of Rome. Faced with disaster and the invasion of its Christian territories by the heathen hordes, what did the Roman Church do? It took the conscious decision to proselytise these incomers and to convert them *en masse*. And this is precisely what a series of heroic Christian missionaries did over the following centuries (often suffering martyrdom in the process) until eventually in AD 800 Charlemagne - Charles the Great - could be crowned in Rome as the first emperor of Christian Europe the new Holy Roman Empire.

But what is the policy now of the Roman Catholic Church as 1,200 years later it again sees its territories invaded and alien faiths planted in its

**ARTHUR ROCHE: Out of touch with the people of the Leeds**







lands? (To the extent that one of the largest mosques in Europe has been built in Rome itself, with Saudi Arabian money, despite the fact that Saudi Arabia will not allow a single Christian church to be built in its territory and criminalises even *private* Christian gatherings!

But then, this imbalance between demanding and taking, but refusing to give anything in return is inherent in Islam so that even the previous Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr George Carey, denounced this lack of 'reciprocity' and called on Islam to rectify it. Impossible! It is built into the basic aggressive constitution of the Muslim faith). The Catholic Church *welcomes* the newcomers, despite the fact that most of them are fake asylum seekers or economic migrants who have often lied and cheated their way into other people's territory and now help themselves to benefits and handouts they have not paid a penny towards; it *confirms* them in the errors of their false religions, effectively doubting the efficacy of its own and admitting what Christ denied, that the heathen can win salvation by their fake religions; it *encourages* the provision of mosques and other places of worship, and of schools and religious instruction in these alien faiths; it *approves* of public money being spent which effectively enables these settlers to widen the city districts they have turned into mono-cultural and racial deserts, to strengthen their own cultures and languages, and even to build such places as cultural centres and religious colleges from which they now evangelise the host communities, seeking converts to their strange gods!

Given the collapse in indigenous European birthrates due to the culture of contraception and abortion, actually encouraged by some of the Christian churches and winked at by others, and the much higher birthrates of the immigrant communities, constantly augmented by yet more 'asylum seekers' and migrants, it is only a matter of time before Christianity petrifies into an ageing, neglected and despised rump, and the incoming religions - particularly Islam - struggle for dominance in the European vacuum thus created. How Charlemagne and the great proselytising popes (such as Gregory the Great who sent Augustine to convert the English, or Innocent III who despatched the first



Crusade to regain the Holy Land from the Muslim invaders) would have wept!

What is the fundamental cause of this self-betrayal of Christianity, which has had such disastrous consequences for the British people? The root cause is Modernism, a theory which achieved coherence in the nineteenth century and effectively took over Western Christian thinking in the twentieth.

Briefly, it claims that mankind comes to know the truth about God *not* by an outward and objective revelation freely given by God himself, but by an indistinct and subjective inner yearning which gradually coalesces into the metaphorical and poetic statements of faith. Different men and cultures will produce different metaphorical structures - now called religions. But all of these structures will contain some essence of the truth. Therefore, *all* religions are in some sense true, or at least seeking for the truth, and all share a common kernel of truth. Therefore, there are no 'false' religions and all men can achieve eternal salvation by sincerely practising the tenets of their particular religion. Therefore, Christianity is not unique and can make no special claim to truth.

Now that's a pretty good argument against the historical claims of Christianity, but how strange to find it being promoted by the leaders of the

few remaining Christians themselves! Ironically, the chief benefactor of this largesse is Christianity's great competitor - Islam. But you will rarely hear Muslims propounding such self-defeating theories because, quite sensibly, they claim there can be only one truth and that truth cannot allow rights to those in error, therefore it is the *duty* of Islam to impose itself on all other false religions, (and only if it cannot convert should it reluctantly tolerate). And *that* was the classical Christian view, now turned on its head by our current crop of pusillanimous Western Christian leaders.

Our contemporary modernists continue: because for them all religions are in some sense relative and can embody truth, it becomes unacceptable for Christians to seek actively to convert others. For all of its history Christianity has been a great proselytising religion, as it was commanded to be by its founder, Jesus Christ. And as Islam is today. But proselytism requires you to have faith and our contemporary Christian leaders do not have faith, merely a theory. And besides, it is *such* bad manners to insist that your 'truth' is better than someone else's. So our church leaders have abandoned proselytism (as being aggressive, discriminatory and not sufficiently inclusive) for a new theory of 'evangelisation'. Sounds similar? By



no means! One evangelises by *not* telling other people the truth, by *not* insisting on the exclusive saving claims of Jesus, but by 'being there' for others, helping them to find what's true for them in whatever shape or form suits them in short, for example, by - helping a Muslim to be a better Muslim! In the empty jargon which now passes for Christian thinking, this is called 'lived invitation and service'. This approach has therefore redefined Christianity from being a credal religion, i.e. a religion of truthful saving statements and doctrines, into a 'feeling' religion, one which is true for

you if it makes you and others feel good. Christian *faith* has been replaced by a nebulous category, Christian *hope*; Christian *doctrine* has been replaced by a set of hazy 'Gospel values'. And, of course, 'diversity' has replaced proselytism.

Despite Jesus Christ's explicit words to the contrary, our lazy, frightened and intellectually-challenged Christian leaders no longer seek a Christian society but a cultural tapestry which they fondly believe can be micro-managed - a little more Hinduism here, a dab more Islam there - so that society becomes little more

than some sort of installationist work of art. Imagine: our bishops are the Tracey Emms of religious sociology! ('Excuse me, bishop, where shall we put the soiled knickers?' 'Are they Buddhist knickers?' 'I'm afraid they're Muslim.' 'Oh, that will never do, Julian. We already have a *wonderful* Muslim jockstrap hanging on the end of the bed. What we *really* need, you know, are some used Hindu tissues piled on the floor. That would make such a *magnificent* montage to the glory of God!')

To be continued in the June issue.

## Ethnic Fast Tracking Does Not Work

» Our police force's obsession with positive discrimination and fast track recruiting from ethnic minorities is not only immoral and unfair, it is also downright dangerous.

Take the case of the policeman from Bury in Greater Manchester who was charged on 19/10/2005 at Oldham Magistrates Court with five counts of misconduct in a public office and one of indecent assault in connection with incidents against two women.

Pc Shajan Miah 26 resigned from the Greater Manchester police force on 17/10/2005 after he was charged with the offences.

On 4/10/2005 it was reported that another Greater Manchester policeman has quit his job in disgrace after being convicted of a car insurance scam. Pc Shahid Ahmed, 25, tried to dupe senior colleagues by passing off an invalid motor insurance certificate as genuine.

Officers discovered the certificate had a different make of car listed on it, and was made out by a company which had not traded for five years.

There was also a case last year within the Greater Manchester force whereby another police officer from an ethnic minority was involved in a hit and run car accident, had no insurance and tried to lie his way out of trouble by saying his girlfriend was driving the car at the time, he even went to the trouble of having the car re-sprayed in order to avoid detection.

In that case although the officer was found guilty in court, he was not dismissed from the force! (They obviously can't afford to lose any more: Quotas you know)

This means that by fast tracking recruits from minority communities in order to meet quotas, policemen are being chosen solely on a racial basis and not because of the qualities that should determine whether they deserve such a responsible job, like honesty, integrity and the ability to obey the very laws they are charged with upholding.

This makes it a dangerous policy and as you can see from the three examples above members of the public are

» Says Derek Adams of Manchester.



**BLACK POLICE OFFICERS: Positive discrimination demeans those good enough to make it on their own**

indeed being put at risk of harm, because if you can't trust policemen who can you trust?

This sort of recruitment policy is obviously discriminatory and racist towards white British applicants but must also be extremely demoralising for serving officers of the indigenous population as the policy also extends to promotional opportunities.

For a serving policeman with a good track record to realise that he has been overlooked for promotion merely because there are not enough black or minority Inspectors in the force must be a bitter pill to have to swallow.

The examples I have given are recent occurrences and I have heard of many other such incidents up and down the country of the failure of this ridiculous policy of positive discrimination. It is about time our police forces started recruiting and promoting on merit and scrapped the quota system because what good is having a police force with the correct mix of ethnicity if we cannot trust them to do their job with the honesty, integrity and decency we deserve from our police?

Only the British National Party would restore the tradition of recruiting the best candidates for the job regardless of colour.





Thirty three new seats won. A total of 53 council seats now held - more than double the previous total. BNP councillors in no fewer than 18 separate local authorities. Scores more seats in which just a bit more sustained local work could give us a fresh wave of victories next year.

Everyone, from our firmest supporters to our most bitter opponents, can see our enormous and growing potential. Unfortunately, our enemies also have access to huge amounts of taxpayers' and union members' money, and use it ruthlessly to finance full-time anti-BNP activists, multi-cult propaganda and all sorts of anti-democratic interference in local politics.

If we are to continue to advance we have to be able to match and beat such efforts. We have to expand our organisation, especially our candidate, councillor and organiser training and support programmes.

We can only do so if we increase our income. Now! So we can strike while the iron's hot.

**Yes! I'm over the moon about the BNP's May '06 Election Breakthrough and understand the urgent need for fresh funds to consolidate these gains.**

☐ **£10**      ☐ **£25**      ☐ **£1000**      ☐ **£50**      ☐ **£100**

☐ **Other:** .....

**Name:** .....

**Address:** .....

**Please send to: The Secretary, PO Box 907, Hull, HU6 9WY**

**Please send an SAE if you require an acknowledgement for sums of £25 or less**

## Subscribe To Identity

The following rates are for 6 or 12 issues respectively (please tick box as applicable):

British Isles £17.50 ☐ £35 ☐

Overseas air mail Europe £23.20 ☐ £46.40 ☐

Overseas air mail Middle East, North and South America £26.90 ☐ £53.70 ☐

Overseas air mail Australasia, Far East £26.90 ☐ £53.70 ☐

**Please Note:** These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If you are paying in any other currency, an additional charge of £4.50 is required with cheques and money orders and £2.50 with banknotes.

**Name**

**Address**

**Postcode**

**Telephone**

**E-mail**

All cheques etc should be made payable to 'British National Party' or 'British Heritage' and sent to PO Box 87, Ossett, Wakefield, WF5 8WN. You can subscribe online at [www.bnp.org.uk](http://www.bnp.org.uk). Photocopies can be used.

### Identity Bulk Order Rates

5 - £9.25; 10 - £17; 15 - £24; 20 - £31; 25 - £38; 30 - £44; 40 - £58; 50 - £71; 60 - £84;  
80 - £110; 100 - £135

**Postage** - £2.15 for 5; £3.90 for 10; £7.75 for 15 - 25; £8.80 for 30 - 40;  
£10.00 for 50; £10.80 for 60; £12.55 for 80-100